Can Light Mingle with Darkness?
Can Trinity Affiliate with Toronto?

? ? ? ? ?

"Look . . . to the hole of the pit whence ye are digged." Isa. 51, 1.

"Doth a fountain send forth from the same opening sweet water and bitter?" James 3, 11; R.V.

F5012
1902
T687

The EDITH *and* LORNE PIERCE
COLLECTION *of* CANADIANA

Queen's University at Kingston

To the Senators of Toronto University, and Subscribers to and Members of the Council of Trinity University:

The action of Trinity College in its recent request for affiliation with Toronto University, brings us face to face with the very grave questions whether such a proposal should be listened to, and whether such a scheme can be lawfully carried out. Trinity College was brought into existence in absolute opposition to Toronto University—which was declared to be a "godless College,"—"an unclean thing" from which they were to fly, and with which no honest, conscientious member of the Church of England could, under any circumstances, have aught to do.

The funds that were subscribed to build and to endow Trinity College were all furnished on the basis of its being an independent College, absolutely separated from that which was called "a gorgeous temple of infidelity."

The foundation principles on which Trinity College was founded, are alleged by its founders to be diametrically opposed to those on which Toronto University is based.

The former was to be exclusively for members of the Church of England, with its teaching ever per-

vading its classes—a propagandic establishment for members of that Church. The latter was to be a University for all students—open to all; around which Theological Colleges of the various religious bodies would cluster, receive the benefit of the instruction, so far as there given, and, supplement it by the religious education given by the Divinity Colleges in affiliation with the University.

In the early days of the controversy which resulted in the Constitution which each University now has, the family compact, of which the late Bishop Strachan and Sir John Beverley Robinson were the foremost figures, opposed the Constitution of Toronto University as strenuously as it sustained that of Trinity University.

When the latter was brought into existence, its first Chancellor was Sir John Beverley Robinson. On his death, his son-in-law, the late Senator Allan, succeeded him in this office. On his death, the son of the first Chancellor, Christopher Robinson, Esq., K.C., takes the place of his father. The descendants of the family compact, approving the position taken by their ancestors, endorsed their action by continuing to accept the highest office in the gift of the University.

In order to understand this question, it is necessary to recall what took place during the twenty-five years prior to 1850—the year in which Trinity College was brought into existence.

In answer to the most violent attacks that were made, when it was proposed to pass an Act constituting

a University for the general advantage of the whole community, rather than only for that which was called the National Church, Lord Goderich wrote an explanatory letter to Sir John Colborne, the Lieutenant-Governor of Upper Canada, on the 2nd November, 1831, the following passages from which, show the position then taken by the supporters of such legislation :—

"There can be no doubt that that institution (King's College) was established with the view of giving to the Province of Upper Canada the benefit of complete instruction in all the higher branches of knowledge, and of connecting, in the minds of the provincial youth, those associations which belong to the seat of early education, with their future progress in life; and it is greatly to be regretted that any thing in the constitution of the establishment should have tended to counteract, if not to defeat, this laudable design, and, practically, to deprive the Province of the advantage which was contemplated from its adoption. It cannot, however, be denied, that the exclusive and restrictive character given to King's College has had this effect; and a plan, which was intended to bring together and to harmonize, in the pursuit of the common object of useful knowledge, all classes of His Majesty's subjects, has had the opposite effect of causing uneasiness, complaint and dissension.

"It may, therefore, be assumed that experience has demonstrated that, under the peculiar circumstances of Upper Canada, a college with restrictive tests is altogether inoperative for any useful purpose, and that all that is wanted is such a system of regulations to be established by a law of the Province, for the management of the institution of the Upper Canada College, as might give it the requisite extension and development without subjecting it to any qualification calculated to render it unpopular in the eyes of those various classes of the community for whose benefit, as well as for that of the Church of England, it is established.

"Under these circumstances, I am to convey, through you, to the members of the Corporation of King's College, the earnest recommendation and advice of His Majesty's Government, that they do forthwith surrender to His Majesty, the Charter of King's College of Upper Canada, with any lands which may have been granted to them. . . . . .

"It can scarcely be necessary to say that no part of the endowment of the College would ever be diverted from the great object of the education of youth. It must be regarded as a fund sacredly and permanently appropriated to that object. I presume that the general concurrence of all classes

of society may be anticipated in favour of the erection of a new College upon a more enlarged basis. . . . . .

"But it cannot be the interest of any class of Christians to be an object of jealousy, perhaps of dislike, to those who, differing upon certain points of doctrine and discipline, find themselves debarred by the effect of that difference from an equal share in advantages universally desired, because universally beneficial. . . . . .

"The members of the Church of England should recollect the peculiar situation in which they stand, in the midst of a population of whom so large a portion differs from them in religious opinions, how much that situation exposes them to the chance of painful collision with large masses of their fellow-subjects; and how much the extension of their own Church depends upon the absence of all grounds for such collision.

At a subsequent date when it was thought proper again to state the case of those approving of such legislation, and to reply to the continued and bitter attacks of Bishop Strachan, and those acting with him in the matter, the then Governor-General, Lord Elgin, prepared a State document, which was forwarded to Earl Grey on the 4th February, 1851, from which the following extract is taken :—

"I can take it upon myself, however, to affirm that the framers of this Constitution, while they have felt strongly the importance, with a view to the moral and social interests of the community, of bringing the youth of this country together for instruction in the higher branches of secular learning, and while experience has satisfied them that this object cannot be obtained if denominational teaching be introduced into the University, most emphatically and earnestly repudiate the intention of thereby removing religion from its fitting place in the scheme of a perfect education. On the contrary, they have always hoped and believed that the zeal of the several denominations would induce them to provide Schools or Colleges in the vicinity of the University for the religious training of the youth of their respective communions. They entertain the conviction that a better security for the faith and morals of the Students attending the University, will be furnished by these means than could be supplied by the system lately in operation in King's College. A system which, seeking to combine objects in their nature incompatible, offered in effect to the members of one communion a scanty and imperfect measure of religious training, while it left the youth of other denominations, whom it equally proposed to educate in this respect, wholly unprovided for."

The objections to the endowment of a University, on the foundation described by Lord Goderich and Lord Elgin, are found in a petition presented by Dr. Strachan, the then Bishop of Toronto, to the Legislative Assembly, November, 1843, in which he uses the following language :—

"Your memorialist deems it impossible for your Honourable House to countenance a measure so deadly to the best interests of man.

"The leading object of the Bill is to place all forms of error upon an equality with truth, by patronizing equally within the same institution an unlimited number of sects, whose doctrines are absolutely irreconcilable; a principle in its nature atheistical, and so monstrous in its consequence, that, if successfully carried out, it would utterly destroy all that is pure and holy in morals and religion, and would lead to greater corruption than anything adopted during the madness of the French Revolution, when that unhappy country abjured the Christian faith, and set up in its stead the worship of the goddess of Reason. Such a fatal departure from all that is good, is without a parallel in the history of the world; unless, indeed, some resemblance to it can be found in Pagan Rome, which to please the nations she had conquered, condescended to associate their impure idolatries with her own.

"In accordance with this godless principle, the second object of the Bill is to destroy the Royal Charter of the University of King's College. . . . . .

"The third prominent object of this deadly measure is to restrain the Royal prerogative, so that no Royal Charter shall in future be granted for the establishment of any Seminary whatever with power to confer degrees, except the proposed Institution, and which is to be constituted a complete monopoly of science, and of what it calls Divinity, and so to preclude any class of Her Majesty's subjects, whatever their wishes may be, from escaping its tyrannical and intolerant provisions. . . . . .

"It is decidedly irreligious and revolutionary, since it not only attempts to hold up the Christian religion to the contempt of wicked men, by establishing in the same Seminary various denominations whose principles are hostile and irreconcilable, but disturbs social order by unsettling the property of the whole country . . . . . .

"The most prominent result of such an experiment as that of uniting all denominations of Christians, as well as persons of no religion, in the management of the same institution, must of necessity be anarchy. . . . . .

"What a melancholy specimen of the march of intellect in the nineteenth century does this dishonest and intolerant measure exhibit! . . . . . .

"If it be, as your memorialist is convinced, based on principles at once

inconsistent with the rights of conscience, and of civil and religious liberty. . . . . .

"Should your memorialist unhappily fail in arresting the further progress of this fatal Bill."

In a letter, dated March, 1844, written by the same Bishop, Dr. Strachan, to Sir Charles Metcalfe, as Chancellor of the University of King's College, he again continues his attack on the proposed legislation :—

"If the hideous scheme (or as it is described by our friends in England, 'a project glaringly opposed to every principle of justice, equity and law') proposed during the last session had become a law. . . . . .

"It is not in the nature of things that confidence and respect can ever attend a seat of learning, where if a Church is spoken of, it must be a Church without government; and where, if religion is taught, it must be religion without doctrine."

Subsequently, in March, 1846, the Bishop wrote a letter to the Earl of Cathcart, then administering the government of the Province, from which the following extract is taken :—

"If the College had been allowed to go into operation under its original Charter, then the state of things would have been this : it would have been understood and known to be a seat of learning in connection with the National Church, and in which only the doctrines of that Church would be taught, and its form of public worship maintained. To prevent division, and any danger of those intrigues and struggles for ascendancy which the rivalry of opposing sects is apt to engender, the Council were required to be of one Church."

Again the Bishop returns to the attack, April, 1849, in a petitition presented to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of Canada :—

"That such an utter interdiction of everything religious, as this Bill seeks to establish by Legislative enactment, is without precedent among Christian nations, and can never be submitted to by men really serious and in earnest. An institution which drives all those who, from their living faith, warmth of disposition and sincerity of purpose, are the best qualified to train the young to all that is pure, lovely and sublime in religion, and

noble in science, must become the abhorrence of Christian parents, who can look upon it in no other light than that of an infidel College, dead to all sense of religious truth, and unworthy of the blessing of Heaven." . . .

"Your petitioner farther submits that, should this measure become law, the noble endowment granted by our late Sovereign for the support of King's College, will be wasted in the vain attempt to sustain a University upon a system which enlightened reason and conscience must ever condemn, which is not sanctioned by experience in any age or country, nor, as your petitioner believes, by the feelings and opinions of any considerable number of those (of whatever religious denomination) who can best appreciate the objects of a University education, and who alone are likely to avail themselves of its advantages for the instruction of their children."

"That your Petitioner need scarcely declare to your Honourable House that the United Church of England and Ireland can have no connection with such an institution; for she is bound by her interpretation of Christian truth, as embodied in her articles and formularies, to repudiate and reject a system of education not founded on religious principles. . . . . ,

"That not only will the members of the Church of England be virtually excluded from all participation in the proposed College, but the Roman Catholics also; from the utter proscription of religion, the substance and marrow of all education, as is declared in their Petition for aid to their College at Kingston, now before your Honorable House. Nor is there any good ground for assuming that either the Presbyterians or Methodists, or any of the other numerous and respectable Denominations, will patronize an institution where the name of the Saviour is never heard. And those who have Colleges of their own will cling to them more closely than ever, for the Government can offer them nothing so valuable as that which they are requested to give up. Their Charters place them, in honour, by the side of the British Universities; but were they so regardless of their honour and interests as to listen to the invitations of this Bill, they would sink into deserved contempt. . . . . .

"From all which your Petitioner, with all due respect to your Honourable House, enters his most solemn Protest in behalf of the Church of England against this Bill, and the provisions thereof as most injurious to her interests, and subversive of her just rights and privileges—as unconstitutional, and pregnant with future evils, both to Upper and Lower Canada."

This was followed by a petition from the same parties, to the Queen, which contains the following paragraph :—

"That your Majesty's humble petitioners need scarcely represent that they were filled with grief and dismay at this unjust and ungodly act of

legislation, unexampled as they believe in British history, and that they can have no confidence in, or connexion with, an educational institution in which the voice of prayer and praise can never be heard, and from which — by the abolition of all religious services — the acknowledgment of the Deity and belief in the Saviour are excluded."

Which they followed by a petition to the English Parliament, in which these expressions are used :—

"Instead of being religious, the leading feature is the total exclusion of all Christian worship, and so horrible are its tone and provisions on this important point that it even proscribes clergymen from giving any professional instruction whatever on the most important of all subjects. Such an utter interdiction of everything religious as this Act seeks to establish, is without precedent among Christian nations. It drives away all those who from their living Faith, warmth of disposition, and sincerity of purpose, are best qualified to train the young to all that is lovely and sublime in religion, pure in morals, and noble in science. . . . . .

"Your Lordships' Petitioners would further represent, that an Act so iniquitous and unjust could never, as they believe, have passed but for the unhappy union of the two Provinces. . . . . .

"Your Lordships' Petitioners most respectfully represent, that neither the clergy nor the conscientious members of the Church can have any connection with a University such as the Act establishes, which repudiates religion, and in which the voice of praise is never to be heard. . . . . .

"Your Lordships' Petitioners feel sadly humbled thus to be compelled to supplicate for relief from an act of complicated oppression, which seeks without cause to crush the National Church, and even to peril her existence in Upper Canada ; and not only this, but to shackle the minds and destroy the eternal hopes of the rising generation. by compelling them to adopt a system of education which as Christians they must always abhor ; and all this, it would appear, for no other reason than that your Lordships' Petitioners belong to the Church which the Sovereign has sworn to maintain inviolate, and have been ever faithful to the Crown."

The historian of Trinity College thus sums up the arguments of Bishop Strachan and his coadjutors against the scheme of Toronto University, and in favor of that of Trinity College :—

"The very presence of these various Theological Colleges would have a most injurious effect : because the University of Toronto, which proscribes religion, and treats all its forms as matters of indifference, will have no disposition to enforce upon those Pupils, who belong not to these affiliated

Colleges, any reverence for holy things. Hence from the very first we shall have a corps of infidels growing up, and like the wicked, eager to make proselytes, stirring up strife among the youth attached to the different Colleges, and holding up the Colleges themselves as a proof that there is no difference as to the comparative goodness between them ; that the opposite opinions that they hold, shew that truth and falsehood are the same ; that even the faith once delivered to the saints is of no value ; that the most pernicious heresy ever broached is harmless ; and that every man has a right to interpret the Scriptures as he pleases.

"Such a collection of Theological Colleges would become of itself a sort of standing protest against Gospel truth, and be one of the most successful methods ever imagined of holding it up to the contempt and ridicule of flagititious men. But, if we take the matter still more closely, we shall find that the discipline and order of the affiliated Colleges could never be made to harmonize with those of the University of Toronto, and more especially with that belonging to the Church of England.

"Besides, every sect may have its College, or apology for a College, and thus a public sanction be given to all opinions, however mischievous and contradictory, and we should have Socinian, Mormonite, and Swedenborgean Doctors of Divinity, a result which would bring all such degrees into utter contempt. In fine, the very fact of the Church affiliating its College with such a University would indicate a tacit consent to its irreligious principles ; hence nothing is left to the honest and sincere of all Christian denominations but to fly from the unclean thing.

"Finding that every effort to arrest the destruction of King's College had proved unavailing, and knowing that it was impossible for the Church to recognize the institution founded on its ruin, as the only resource left to him in furtherance of the great object of his life, the Lord Bishop addressed the following pastoral to the clergy and laity of the diocese."

From this pastoral of the Bishop, issued in the year 1850, the following extracts are made :—

"On the 1st day of January, 1850, the destruction of King's College as a Christian Institution was accomplished. For on that day the Act establishing the University of Toronto, by which it was suppressed, came into force.

"There was, to the last, some lingering hope that a measure so pernicious would have been arrested.

"It was known that inquiries had been made concerning it by statesmen of high consideration, and that it had not been formally sanctioned by the Imperial Government late in October. But no effectual impediment has yet intervened ; and for a time at least, the experiment of a University from which the worship of God is excluded, is to be tried in Upper Canada.

I say, for a time, because it is scarcely credible that such an institution can be long suffered in a Christian country, or if, unhappily, suffered, that it can prosper. . . . . .

"Hence, a seat of learning devoid of, or hostile to, our common Christianity, must forfeit all title to confidence, and become the worst of all places of mental training for the children of a Christian people. . . . . .

"Never, perhaps, in the history of the Church, did a single case more completely prove the influence of party spirit in corrupting the heart, and warping and entangling the judgment, till it had acquired a moral obliquity, incapable of distinguishing right from wrong, truth from falsehood, than the destruction of King's College. . . . . .

"And, yet, because a small but turbulent minority declared against it, a weak ministry has been found to decree its suppression, and the establishment of an institution in which no Christian can confide. . . . . .

"Its three leading features—contempt for the people, enmity to religion, and disloyalty to their Sovereign—are each of them offensive to large and influential parties. . . . . .

"This act of unscrupulous injustice, ...

"Under the delusion of liberalism and expediency, the twin sisters of infidelity, they betrayed the cause which they were bound by every sacred duty and right feeling to protect. . . . . .

"No Statute passed since the Union of the Provinces has lowered the character of the Canadian Legislature so much as that which destroys King's College. . . . . .

"I shall have completed my seventy-second year before I can reach London, of which more than fifty years have been spent in Upper Canada; and one of my chief objects, during all that time, was to bring King's College into active operation; and now, after more than six years of increasing prosperity, to see it destroyed by stolid ignorance and presumption, and the voice of prayer and praise banished from its halls, is a calamity not easy to bear." . . . . . .

One of the meetings held by the Vestry of St. George's Church, fairly represents the feeling aroused against the Toronto University and the foundation on which it is built :—

"And who knows how soon, if present principles go unchecked, there may be seen on this continent, as the Old World has seen, Christianity trampled under foot—the "Big ha' Bible," hauled in derision at the tail of an ass—and the infidel priests of an infidel generation tearing off the ecclesiastical garments, and announcing their adherence to a religion of 'liberty, equality, and morality;' and another Voltaire and another

Marat, fit representatives of atheism and murder, declaring the creed of the people to be,—'Death is an eternal sleep.'"

This is further illustrated by the sermon of the Reverend Dr. Bethune, subsequently, the Bishop of Toronto, preached at the laying of the corner stone of Trinity :—

"Could we, in contemplation of the dark cloud, and repulsive chill of infidelity, which a public infatuation had brought upon our highest hall of science, help being affected by this Gospel verity, emblazoned as it is upon the very forefront of its holy records, 'Whatsoever is not of faith is sin?' And impressed in our inmost hearts with this solemn conviction, could we, as a veritable branch of the Church of God. do otherwise than part company with an institution which has been made to yield so entirely to the clamours and influence of her enemies? . . . . . .

"We object further to a system which would recognize the lawfulness of religious division, and strike at the foundation of the unity of the Church, in countenancing an assemblage of sects and parties, with an equality of claim and pretension, around what we are constrained to term a gorgeous temple of infidelity."

And finally, on the 15th January, 1852, at the ceremony of inauguration connected with the College, the Bishop, in his address, said :—

"On the 7th of February, 1850, or about five weeks after King's College had ceased to exist, I sent a Pastoral letter to the Clergy and Laity of the Diocese, informing them that we had been deprived of King's College, the gift of our Sovereign, and that an University had been substituted in its stead, with which we could not in any sense, as religious men, co-operate — that it therefore was incumbent on us to sacrifice endowment rather than principle ; and, as it was impossible for us, great as the sacrifice might be, to hold connexion with an Institution essentially anti-christian, though originally bearing the honoured name of its Royal Founder, George IV, and established expressly for religious purposes, it became a matter of necessity, as well as duty, to establish a University from our private resources, in close connexion with the Church to which we had the happiness to belong."

It is not only that Bishop Strachan and his coadjutors built Trinity as a Church of England College on the narrow lines necessary to carry out their scheme, but

they did all in their power to discredit and ruin the Provincial University. What further anathemas could have been pronounced against any institution of learnning than those which the Right Reverend champion and his followers hurled against Toronto University.

Let the descendants of these prophets ponder over what those, they now represent, left them as their inheritance, and may it encourage them not to be false to the trust they have from them received and accepted.—Weigh their most emphatic language :

This project of a Provincial University is "deadly "to the best interests of man," it places "all forms of "error upon an equality with truth." It is, "in its "nature, atheistical, and monstrous in its consequence." "It would "utterly destroy all that is pure and holy in "morals and religion." It would "lead to greater cor- "ruption than anything adopted during the madness of "the French Revolution." It is "without a parallel in "the history of the world, unless, indeed, some resem- "blance to it can be found in Pagan Rome." It is "based on "godless principles." It is a "deadly "measure, its provisions are tyrannical and intolerant." "It is "irreligious and revolutionary." "It holds up "the Christian religion to the contempt of wicked "men." "The result of it must be anarchy." It is "a "dishonest and intolerant measure." It is "in- "consistent with the rights of conscience." It is "a "hideous scheme." It will result in having "a corps "of infidels growing up." It will "stir up strife." "It will "show that truth and falsehood are the

"same"; and that "even the faith once delivered to "the Saints is of no value;" that "the most per- "nicious heresy ever broached is harmless. It will "be "a sort of standing protest against Gospel truth." "It indicates "a tacit consent to its irreligious prin- "ciples." There is nothing "left to the honest and "sincere of all Christian denominations but to fly from "the unclean things." "It is "without precedent "among Christian nations." It "must become the "abhorrence of Christian parents." It is "an infidel "College, dead to all sense of religious truth, and un- "worthy of the blessing of heaven." It is based "upon "a system which enlightened reason and con- "science must ever condemn." "The united Church "of England and Ireland can have no connection with "such an institution." If they were "so regardless "of their honor and interests as to listen to the invi- "tation of this Bill, they would sink into deserved "contempt." It is "unconstitutional and pregnant "with future evils, both to Upper and Lower Canada." "It is an "unjust and ungodly mode of legislation, "unexampled in British history." They can "have "no confidence in or connection with such an edu- "cational establishment;" "its tones and provisions "are horrible." It "is without precedent among "Christian nations." "The Act is iniquitous and "unjust." "Neither the Clergy nor the conscientious "members of the Church can have any connection with "a University such as the Act establishes." It is "an "Act of complicated oppression;" "It "shackles

"the minds and destroys the eternal hopes of the "rising generation." It is "a system of education "which, as Christians, they must abhor." It is "im- "possible for the Church to recognize the institution "founded on its ruin." "A measure so pernicious "should have been arrested." "It is scarcely credible "that such an institution can be long suffered in a "Christian country, or, if unhappily suffered, that it "can prosper." "A seat of learning devoid of, or "hostile, to our common Christianity, must forfeit all "title to confidence and become the worst of all places "of mental training for the children of a Christian "people." "An institution in which no Christian "can confide ; "its three leading features are :—con- "tempt for the people ; enmity to religion, and dis- "loyalty to the Sovereign." "It is an act of "unscrupulous injustice." "It was brought into "existence under the delusion of liberalism and ex- "pediency—the twin sisters of infidelity." "No "Statute passed since the union of the Provinces has "lowered the character of the Canadian Legislature "so much as that which destroys King's College." "The dark cloud and repulsive chill of infidelity has "been brought upon our highest Hall of Science." "'As a veritable branch of the Church of God we "could not do otherwise than part company with an "institution which has been made to yield so entirely "to the clamours and influences of her enemies." "A "system which would recognize the lawfulness of "religious division and strike at the foundation of the

"unity of the Church in countenancing an assemblage "of sects and parties with an equality of claim and "pretension around what we are constrained to term "'a gorgeous temple of infidelity.'" "A University "had been substituted in its stead, in which we could "not in any sense, as religious men, co-operate." "It, "therefore, was incumbent to sacrifice endowment "rather than principle." "It was impossible, great "as the sacrifice might be, to hold connection with an "institution essentially anti-Christian." "It became "a matter of necessity, as well as duty, to establish a "University from private resources in close connection "with the Church to which we have the happiness "to belong."

And now, after fifty years of progress, notwithstanding these maledictions, the Provincial University having proved itself a great success—sustained by all the religious bodies but the Baptists—and with more members of the Church of England attending it than attend Trinity, the latter proposes to ask Toronto to forget all its abuse and to make an alliance with this University, which the founders of Trinity sought to destroy.

Toronto University continues on the same foundation. How can the donations to Trinity be misapplied in its union with this "godless infidel College," this "unclean thing," this "gorgeous temple of infidelity," based on "wrong and robbery," to destroy which, Trinity was brought into existence.

I am not dealing with the humiliation and ignominy

involved in the present representatives of Trinity swallowing the vocabulary which it has used in seeking to build itself up and to cast down Toronto University; but I deal simply with the legal or equitable position,—can the rights of the benefactors of Trinity be absolutely ignored and their moneys be used to procure an alliance absolutely abhorred by them? Even the extreme needs of Trinity, at the present time, could not lawfully be made a ground for so shameful an act.

? ? ? ? ? ?

JANUARY, 1902.